

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Christopher T. Wilder,)	C/A No. 0:20-3753-JFA-PJG
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER AND
)	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
Mental Health Department; Lieber Corr. Inst.;)	
Mrs. Officer Burch; Officer PA Mr. Edwards,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

Plaintiff Christopher T. Wilder, a self-represented state prisoner, brings this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The Complaint has been filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915;¹ § 1915A. This matter is before the court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.). By order dated December 1, 2020, the court provided Plaintiff the opportunity to file an amended complaint to correct deficiencies identified by the court that would warrant summary dismissal of the Complaint. (ECF No. 7.) The court found that the Complaint failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted because Defendants Mental Health Department and Lieber Correctional Institution are not entities amenable to suit pursuant to § 1983 and Plaintiff failed to provide any facts about Defendants Burch or Edwards that would plausibly show that they were involved in a violation of Plaintiff's rights.

Plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint to correct the deficiencies identified in the court's order. Therefore, Plaintiff's Complaint should be summarily dismissed for the reasons

¹ Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is granted. (ECF No. 13.)

stated in the court's December 1, 2020 order. Accordingly, the court recommends that this matter be summarily dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.



March 5, 2021
Columbia, South Carolina

Paige J. Gossett
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

*The parties are directed to note the important information in the attached
“Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation.”*

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); see Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Robin L. Blume, Clerk
United States District Court
901 Richland Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).